UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,359	01/31/2002	Scot R. Weinberger	CiphBio-9	5296

1473 7590 02/25/2004

FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
50TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER	
DAVIS, DEBORAH A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1641	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/066,359	WEINBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Deborah A Davis	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11-24-04*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-5 and 15-26* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: *See Continuation Sheet*.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: This is a corrected Office Action Summary.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed November 24, 2003 is acknowledged. Currently, claims 1-5 and 15-26 are withdrawn and claims 6-8 and 10-13 are amended. Claims 6-14 are under consideration for examination.

Office Action Summary

2. Examiner inadvertently failed to include claim 6 as being a rejected claim in the Office Action Summary. A corrected replacement sheet is included in the Final Response.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William T. Hutchens (WO98/59362) in view of Dongre et al (Emerging tandem-mass-spectrometry techniques for the rapid identification of proteins, TIBTECH, Vol. 15, October 1997).

The instant claims are directed to a method for identifying a protein that is differentially displayed between two complex biologic samples using mass

spectrometry. William T. Hutchens teaches methods for identifying analytes that are differentially expressed between biological materials using desorption spectrometry (see abstract). The two samples are differentially displayed because the proteins can be expressed in different cell types being normal versus pathologic cancer cells. The method may indicate that a protein or other biomolecule is increased or decreased in expression, or is changed in some way based on different mass (page 63, lines 1-32). Claim 6, steps (b) through (c) is directed to fragmenting proteins in two samples and detecting protein fragments determining the identity and correlating the fragments that are differentially displayed between the two samples. William T. Hutchens teaches that the fragmenting of large proteins into smaller pieces by enzymatic digestion increases sensitivity in detection of protein fragments. Fragmentation can be achieved by any means known in the art; some examples are enzymes such as glycosidase, endoproteases (page 64, lines 28-32). William T. Hutchens teaches proteins that are differentially present in two samples will increase the number of signals from that protein (page 64, lines 11-24). William T. Hutchens teaches that these methods of protein identification are useful for identifying diagnostic markers of disease expressed in a patient sample or a diseased cultured cell compared to normal samples (page 64, lines 1-10). Maps of the protein samples are compared, which may indicate increased or decreased expression in a protein (page 63, lines 22-32). Accordingly, the matched parameters can be set to identify the closeness-of-fit between the protein analyte characteristics and the characteristics of the reference polypeptides in the database (page 61, lines 15-31). William T. Hutchens' method further includes a capture probe to

capture proteins. William T. Hutchens' instant reference teaches probes for the specific detection of one or more analytes by desorption spectrometry, which can be prepared by selecting markers to be detected (page 59, lines 19-33).

The instant reference of William T. Hutchens does not teach utilizing the method with tandem mass spectrometry; neither does it teach steps of a secondary fragmentation step to generate parent peptides with a gas phase.

However, Dongre et al provides an overview of techniques and methodologies for identification of proteins and peptides from complex biological samples utilizing tandem mass spectrometry (see abstract). Tandem mass spectrometry is commonly used for sequence analysis of peptides and proteins that include techniques such as Collision Induced Dissociation (CID) that involves the collision of peptide ions in a gas phase at low speeds with an inert gas such as argon. The fragment ions generated from the gas collision, upon peptide-ion activation are then analyzed by a second mass analyzer (page 419, column 1 and Figure 1). The correct amino acid sequence is frequently identified purely on the basis of the preliminary score and a closeness-to-fit method is used to confirm the highest-scoring amino acid sequence and increase the sensitivity of the search (page 423, column 1, paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference of William T Hutchens to include tandem mass spectrometry and a secondary fragmenting step for generating peptides using gas as taught by Dongre et al because tandem mass spectrometry has several advantages. First, identification is possible on the basis of a single peptide spectrum. Second, each tandem mass spectrum

represents an independent piece of information, and so additional spectra that match the same protein add considerable strength to the identification. Third, the ability to identify proteins based on a single tandem mass spectrum allows the identification of proteins present in complex mixtures. Finally, post-translational modification do not appear to complicate the identification and can be placed within the amino acid sequence at the specific site of modification with the aid of computer programs (page 424, column 2, paragraph 2). Utilizing a secondary fragmenting step for generating peptides is also a method utilized by tandem mass analyses. This step is an advantage for tandem mass spectrometry because under low and high-energy gas-phase collision induced dissociation (CID) conditions, peptide ions that are generated mostly fragment at the peptide bonds along the backbone, generating a ladder of sequence ions. This information dictates which type of amino acid sequence will form and have lead to sequencing methods which is important when predicting peptide-fragmentation patterns (page 419, column 1).

5. Claims 6, and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liebler et al (USP# 6,379,970) in view of Dongre et al (Emerging tandem-mass-spectrometry techniques for the rapid identification of proteins, TIBTECH, Vol. 15, October 1997).

The instant claims are directed to a method for identifying a protein that is differentially displayed between two complex biologic samples using mass spectrometry.

Liebler et al teaches a method for detecting peptide fragments of protein(s) that are differentially present in biological samples. The identity of the peptides may be determined and correlated with the protein(s) that are differentially present in the samples (see abstract). Claim 6, steps (b) through (c) is directed to fragmenting proteins in two samples and detecting protein fragments determining the identity and correlating the fragments that are differentially displayed between the two samples. Liebler et al teaches protein fragmentation wherein the proteins are digested in a plurality of biological samples to produce peptides in each sample; separating the peptides in the samples and identifying the peptides that are differentially present. The proteins contained in the biological samples may be digested with any of the well-known protein digestions reagents. Such reagents may be chemical or enzymatic (col. 5, lines 15-26 and col. 10, lines 1-20). The instant claim 6 utilizes mass spectrometry for detection of peptide and proteins. Liebler et al teaches that a variety of mass spectrometry techniques are routinely used to determine peptide sequence. Two MS ionization methods used in the field of protein analysis are electrospray ionization (ESI) and matrix assisted laser desorption ionization (MALDI). Both methods are effective means of producing gas phase ions of proteins peptides and other biomolecules for MS analysis (col. 7 lines 30-65). One non-limiting embodiment of the present invention involves the analysis of two peptide mixtures together in one analytical run. Once the mixtures are combined and then subjected to some analytical separation the differential expression of the precursor protein are then selected for further analysis by mass spectrometry (col. 4, lines 32-45). Correlation of differentially produced peptides with

differentially expressed proteins is performed by using amino acid sequences of signature peptides against a database of protein sequences (col. 8, lines 38-67). Samples may comprise of cultured cells, blood samples, biopsy or other biological fluids.

Liebler et al does not particularly point out using tandem mass spectrometry as recited in claim 6.

However, Dongre et al provides an overview of techniques and methodologies for identification of proteins and peptides from complex biological samples utilizing tandem mass spectrometry (see abstract). Tandem mass spectrometry is commonly used for sequence analysis of peptides and proteins that include techniques such as Collision Induced Dissociation (CID) that involves the collision of peptide ions in a gas phase at low speeds with an inert gas such as argon. The fragment ions generated from the gas collision, upon peptide-ion activation are then analyzed by a second mass analyzer (page 419, column 1 and Figure 1). The correct amino acid sequence is frequently identified purely on the basis of the preliminary score and a closeness-to-fit method is used to confirm the highest-scoring amino acid sequence and increase the sensitivity of the search (page 423, column 1, paragraph 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference of Liebler et al to include tandem mass spectrometry and a secondary fragmenting step for generating peptides using gas as taught by Dongre et al because tandem mass spectrometry has several advantages. First, identification is possible on the basis of a single peptide spectrum. Second, each tandem mass spectrum

represents an independent piece of information, and so additional spectra that match the same protein add considerable strength to the identification. Third, the ability to identify proteins based on a single tandem mass spectrum allows the identification of proteins present in complex mixtures. Finally, post-translational modification do not appear to complicate the identification and can be placed within the amino acid sequence at the specific site of modification with the aid of computer programs (page 424, column 2, paragraph 2). Utilizing a secondary fragmenting step for generating peptides is also a method utilized by tandem mass analyses. This step is an advantage for tandem mass spectrometry because under low and high-energy gas-phase collision induced dissociation (CID) conditions, peptide ions that are generated mostly fragment at the peptide bonds along the backbone, generating a ladder of sequence ions. This information dictates which type of amino acid sequence will form and have lead to sequencing methods which is important when predicting peptide-fragmentation patterns (page 419, column 1).

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William T. Hutchens in view of Dongre et al and further in view of Little et al (USP#6,322,970).

The teachings of William T. Hutchens in view of Dongre et al are set forth above and differ from the instant claim in not specifically pointing out analyzing capture proteins on a probe.

However, Little et al teaches methods of detecting polypeptides using mass spectrometry. Little et al teaches using a microchip to isolate a polypeptide as well as a means to manipulate the isolated target polypeptide prior to mass spectrometry. In

particular embodiments, post-translational capture and immobilization of a target polypeptide are provided in order to sequence a polypeptide. This method includes immobilizing the target polypeptide to a solid surface and cleaving the fragments with enzymatic treatment, which will improve mass spectrometric analysis (col. 4, lines 24-67 and col. 6, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of William T. Hutchens in view of Dongre et al to include a microchip as taught by Little et al to capture proteins fragments because it will improve mass spectrometric analysis of protein fragments.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed November 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.:

Applicant argues that the primary reference of Hutchens et al teaches steps (a) and (b) but not (c). However, Applicant does acknowledge that the secondary reference of Dongre et al teaches a portion of step (c), but not step (a) and (b).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the instant case, applicant's own admission acknowledges that steps (a), (b) and (c) are obvious over the combination of Hutchens in view of Dongre et al. Although

applicant asserts only part of step (c) is taught by the secondary reference of Dongre, this argument is not found persuasive because Dongre et al teaches Tandem Mass spectrometry is a commonly used for sequence analysis of peptides and proteins (see page 419, column 1) which is called for by the instant step (c).

Applicant argument that the reference of Hutchens or Dongre does not teach step (d) that calls for correlating the identity of the protein cleavage product with a differentially displayed protein as detected in step (a) is acknowledged but not found persuasive.

The reference of Hutchens teaches the correlation of step (d) where that proteins that are differentially present in two samples will increase the number of signals from the proteins (see page 64, lines11-24 and 28-32).

Applicant argues that the reference of Liebler does not teach applicant's step (a) of detecting at least one protein that is differentially displayed in the mass spectrometry of two samples. Applicant argues that the present is based in part on detecting the differential expression of the same protein in two samples by analysis of peptide fragment from each sample. Applicant argues that the method include digesting the protein into samples to a mixture of peptide and them comparing the abundances of specific peptides.

These arguments are not noted but not found persuasive because the reference of Liebler et al teaches step (a) by disclosing a method for detecting fragments of proteins that are differentially present in biological samples. Identity of peptides may be determined and correlated with the proteins that are differentially present in samples

(see column 5, lines 15-26 and column 10, lines 1-20). Liebler also teaches a variety of mass spectrometry techniques are routinely used to determine peptides and discloses examples (see column 7, lines 30-65). Although Liebler does not use Tandem mass spectrometry, the reference of Dongre teaches the advantages of using this device as recited in the above arguments.

Applicant argues that step (d) is not taught by Liebler is not found persuasive because step (d) is drawn to a correlating the identity of the protein cleavage product with differentially displayed protein of step (a) taught by Hutchens et al as acknowledged by applicant. Liebler teaches step (d) by disclosing a correlation step of peptides digested from proteins that are differentially present in the samples (see abstract).

Applicant argues that there is not motivation to combine the references of Liebler and Dongre but does not point out a reason. This argument is not found persuasive for reasons given in the motivation statement of the previous office action.

Applicant argues that the reference of Little et al does not teach an affinity capture probe as defined by the instant specification. This argument is not found persuasive because Little et al teaches utilizing a microchip to capture and immobilize target peptides for sequence analysis – a teaching that is encompassed by the definition of affinity capture probe (see column 4, lines 24-67).

For reasons aforementioned above, rejections are maintained and made final.

Conclusion

8. No claims are allowed.

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah A Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-0818. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571) 272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Deborah A. Davis
Remsen Bldg., Room 3D58
February 20, 2003

LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600
02/23/04